DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 428 142 UD 032 811

AUTHOR	Gold, Rosalind; Vargas, Arturo; DeSipio, Louis; Pachon, Harry
TITLE	America's Newest Voices: Colombians, Dominicans, Guatemalans and Salvadorans in the United States Examine Their Public Policy Needs.
INSTITUTION	National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials Educational Fund, Los Angeles, CA.; Tomas Rivera Policy Inst., Claremont, CA.
SPONS AGENCY	Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, New York, NY.
PUB DATE	1998-00-00
NOTE	53p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Dominicans; Elementary Secondary Education; Employment Patterns; English (Second Language); *Hispanic Americans; *Immigrants; Immigration; Needs Assessment; *Parent Attitudes; Participation; *Public Policy; *Social Services; Telephone Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	California (Los Angeles); Colombian Americans; Guatemalan Americans; *Latinos; New York (New York); Salvadoreans

ABSTRACT

The public policy needs of Colombians and Dominicans in the New York (New York) area and Salvadorans and Guatemalans in the Los Angeles (California) area were studied through a telephone survey of 1,503 Latinos. The survey population was generally representative of the emerging Latino populations, although the sample contained more immigrants and women than the overall population. Survey respondents had lower household incomes on average than other residents of the United States and were more likely to be unemployed. Respondents expressed opinions on a number of public policy and social service issues, but their opinions about education were especially interesting. Dominicans, Guatemalans, and Salvadorans thought that the most important issue facing their children was inadequate schools. Colombians were more likely to mention language problems, but inadequate schools came in second. Survey respondents were generally satisfied with the quality of English language instruction in their schools, a finding that contradicts the concerns expressed by community leaders in an earlier related study. Overall, the survey indicates that emerging Latino residents, like the Latino community as a whole, are becoming active participants in U.S. society. The study concludes that policymakers should be concerned that the services being used by these communities, services that are used at a relatively low level, are not necessarily meeting the needs that Latinos consider most important. An appendix discusses the survey sampling methodology. (Contains 17 tables and 8 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 428 142

America's Newest Voices:

Colombians, Dominicans, Guatemalans and Salvadorans in the United States Examine Their Public Policy Needs

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Y. R. Ingle

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

UD 032811

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LATINO ELECTED AND APPOINTED OFFICIALS EDUCATIONAL FUND

THE TOMAS RIVERA POLICY INSTITUTE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Emerging Latino Survey Project Research Team

NALEO Educational Fund/Tomás Rivera Policy Institute Project on Emerging Latino Populations

Harry Pachon, Kenan Professor of Politics at the Claremont Graduate University, President of the Tomás Rivera Policy Institute and Chairman of the NALEO Educational Fund Board of Directors served as principal investigator for the NALEO Educational Fund/Tomás Rivera Policy Institute Project on Emerging Latino Populations. Louis DeSipio, Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, served as co-principal investigator and managed the project.

Under the direction of the co-principal investigators, Eve Fielder of the University of California, Los Angeles Survey Research Center managed the survey. Jay Sumner designed the sampling methodology.

Together with Louis DeSipio and Harry Pachon, Rosalind Gold, Director of Policy Research and Operations with the NALEO Educational Fund and Arturo Vargas, Executive Director of the NALEO Educational Fund, wrote this report. Ms. Gold also coordinated its publication.

The NALEO Educational Fund and the Tomás Rivera Policy Institute gratefully acknowledge the support provided by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and the John Randolph Haynes and Dora Haynes Foundation for the Emerging Latino Populations Project Research activities.

We also express our appreciation to the Claremont Graduate University.

America's Newest Voices:
Colombians, Dominicans, Guatemalans, and Salvadorans in the United States Examine Their Public Policy Needs

The Tomás Rivera
POLICY INSTITUTE

The National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials (NALEO) Educational Fund is the leading national organization that empowers Latinos to participate fully in the American political process, from citizenship to public service.

Established in 1985, the Tomás Rivera Policy Institute is a national institute for public policy studies dedicated to improving the well-being of the nation's Latino community through vigorous, socially significant policy research.

The National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials (NALEO) Educational Fund
5800 S. Eastern Ave., Suite 365
Los Angeles, CA 90040
(213) 720-1932 Fax: (213) 720-9519
www.naleo.org

The Tomás Rivera Policy Institute
241 E. Eleventh Street
Steele Hall, Third Floor
Claremont, CA 91711-6194
(909) 621-8897 Fax: (909) 621-8898
www.cgs.edu/inst/trc.html

The Tomás Rivera Policy Institute
P.O. Box 8047
Austin, TX 78713-8047
(512) 471-2872 Fax: (512) 471-2873

© 1998 The NALEO Educational Fund and The Tomás Rivera Policy Institute

Contents

Introduction	1
The Survey Population	4
Public Policy Needs and the Quality of Services Delivered	14
Public Services Use by Emerging Latino Populations	17
Community Public Policy Needs: Mass and Elite Opinon	30
Conclusions	35
Appendix Sampling Methodology	44

America's Newest Voices:
Colombians, Dominicans, Guatemalans, and Salvadorans in the United States Examine Their Public Policy Needs

Introduction

Over the past two decades, the nation's Latino community has grown and become more diverse. During this period, Latinos from throughout Latin America and the Caribbean migrated to the United States in record numbers. They have joined other Latinos with a longer history in the United States, such as the many who trace their ancestry to Mexico, Puerto Rico, and Cuba. Moreover, Latinos have moved from areas of concentration such as Los Angeles, New York, Miami, and South Texas to places that Latinos have not traditionally made their home. This growing heterogeneity presents a challenge for scholars interested in the Latino experience. On the one hand, because of the rapid growth of the Latino population, researchers were unable to study the population contemporaneously with its growth. As late as the 1980s, there was little methodologically rigorous study of Latinos. When researchers commenced such studies, they were so focused on learning about the basic characteristics of Latinos that they were not able to turn their attention to the smaller Latino national-origin populations. Thus, many researchers analyzed the Latino community by examining common experiences shared by all Latinos, or by focusing solely on the experiences of the larger populations.

Although the Latino community has become more diverse over the past two decades, little research exists about the newest Latino populations.

On the other hand, scholars have had to shape their research questions recognizing the reality of the growing heterogeneity of the Latino community. Instead of viewing all Latinos as a monolithic ethnic population, researchers have had to critically evaluate and accurately measure the individual experiences of each Latino national-origin group in order to capture the true complexity of the Latino population.

Research Overview

In an effort to strengthen research on "emerging" Latino populations, our survey examined the public policy needs of Colombians and Dominicans in the New York area and Salvadorans and Guatemalans in the Los Angeles area.

In an effort to strengthen the existing research on Latino communities in the United States and to investigate the public policy needs of these communities, the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials (NALEO) Educational Fund and the Tomás Rivera Policy Institute (TRPI) undertook a joint research project to evaluate the public policy needs of the four largest "emerging" Latino populations — Colombians, Dominicans, Guatemalans, and Salvadorans.[1] Harry Pachon, President of the Tomás Rivera Policy Institute and Chair of the NALEO Educational Fund Board of Directors, served as principal investigator for the project. Louis DeSipio, Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, served as co-principal investigator and managed the project.

The four national-origin populations that were the focus of the study are the largest after Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Cuban Americans (the latter three are the most extensively studied Latino populations). This report presents the findings of a telephone survey of 1,503 Colombians, Dominicans, Guatemalans, and Salvadorans residing in the metropolitan areas where these emerging Latino populations are most densely concentrated — New York and Northern New Jersey for Colombians and Dominicans and Los Angeles County for Salvadorans and Guatemalans. This project is the first comprehensive, comparative study of these populations.

This survey was the third stage of a research project analyzing these populations. The first stage produced demographic portraits and the second assessed community organizations and the views of community leaders on public policy issues.

This report has been produced in connection with the third and final stage of a comprehensive research project analyzing these populations. The first two stages of the project were designed to allow us to collect background data necessary to conduct this survey; each stage also produced previously unavailable research on these communities. The first stage produced demographic profiles of each of the four populations. The NALEO Educational Fund and the Tomás Rivera Policy Institute published the results of this first stage of the project in two publications entitled: *Constructing the New York Area Hispanic Mosaic: A Demographic Portrait of Colombians and Dominicans in New York* and *Constructing the Los Angeles Area Latino Mosaic: A Demographic Portrait of Guatemalans and Salvadorans in Los Angeles*.

The second stage of the research identified community-based organizations in each of these four communities. After we identified and profiled the universe of community-

based organizations, we conducted focus group interviews with selected organizational leaders. These interviews explored the public policy needs of these communities as well as the leaders' perceptions of opportunities and barriers to group-based political mobilization. This stage of the project also resulted in two published studies: *Diversifying the New York Area Hispanic Mosaic: Colombian and Dominican Leaders' Assessments of Community Public Policy Needs* and *Diversifying the Los Angeles Area Latino Mosaic: Salvadoran and Guatemalan Leaders' Assessments of Community Public Policy Needs.*

The survey reported on here includes data from interviews with 375 Colombians, 377 Dominicans, 376 Guatemalans, and 375 Salvadorans. We conducted telephone interviews using a questionnaire designed by the co-principal investigators which was largely shaped by the findings of the first two research stages. Each survey took approximately thirty minutes to complete. Depending on the language preference of the respondent, the survey could be administered in Spanish or English. All of the interviewers were fully bilingual.

Under the direction of the co-principal investigators, Eve Fielder of the University of California, Los Angeles Survey Research Center managed the survey. Jay Sumner designed the sampling methodology. A more complete discussion of the survey methodology can be found in the appendix.

These 1,503 completed interviews constitute the largest survey of these populations yet conducted. The primary focus of the survey, like the larger project, was the public policy needs of these communities and their perceptions of the quality of services received. In the report that follows, we first present a portrait of survey respondents and then discuss their perceptions of the pressing issues in their communities and the availability and quality of public services to address these needs.

Our survey encompassed 1,503 interviews, the largest ever conducted among the emerging Latino populations.

The Survey Population

With respect to many key characteristics, our survey population was generally representative of the emerging Latino populations as a whole. However, our sample was comprised of a larger share of immigrants and women than the overall population.

In order to place the responses of the survey population in an appropriate context, we start by discussing two characteristics of the respondents to the Emerging Latino Survey — their demographic traits and their immigration and settlement traits. We offer these profiles as a backdrop to our discussion of the public policy needs of these communities. The profiles also provide the opportunity to compare the survey respondents to the emerging Latino populations as a whole.

For any survey to claim a valid representation of the attitudes of the population under study, those surveyed must be broadly representative of the larger population. We believe that our sample generally captures the key characteristics of the larger emerging Latino populations. However, as we discuss below, there are certain ways in which our respondents differ from those populations.[2] In particular, our sample was comprised of a larger share of immigrants and women than the population as a whole, and the sample did not include any persons under the age of 18.

With these potential limitations in mind, then, it is important to examine the characteristics of the individuals who responded to the survey. The best source for comparison is two demographic profiles of these populations conducted as a background to this survey. These reports tap a variety of data sources, such as the census and Immigration and Naturalization Service data, to shape an understanding of the context in which these communities organize to meet their public policy needs. In the discussion that follows, we will note discrepancies between survey respondents and the population as a whole in the same communities where we conducted the survey.

Survey Respondent Demographics

The typical respondent to the Emerging Latino Survey was a married woman in her late thirties, who was born abroad, had children, and who was working at the time of the survey. She had nine to twelve years of education, but had not completed high school (see Table 1.1). Her *household* income in 1995 was between $15,000 and $19,999 (see Table 1.2).

Table 1.1. Demographic Profile of Survey Respondents

	Colombian	Dominican	Guatemalan	Salvadoran
Age (average)	39	38	34	35
Gender				
Men	37.5%	32.7%	47.3%	41.9%
Women	62.5%	67.3%	52.7%	58.1%
Nativity				
U.S.	1.3%	5.1%	0.5%	1.6%
Abroad	98.7%	94.9%	99.5%	98.4%
Marital Status				
Married	47.9%	49.7%	54.5%	53.8%
Separated	14.7%	14.8%	10.2%	10.2%
Divorced	12.5%	10.8%	2.4%	3.5%
Widowed	1.5%	3.7%	1.9%	2.2%
Never married	23.4%	21.1%	31.0%	30.4%
Children				
Yes	68.7%	74.5%	71.5%	77.1%
No	31.3%	25.5%	28.5%	22.9%
Work Status				
Working	65.1%	56.3%	68.0%	70.0%
Unemployed	10.9%	15.2%	10.8%	11.1%
Retired	2.3%	3.3%	1.1%	1.3%
Homemaker	16.6%	18.5%	16.7%	12.7%
Disabled	1.0%	3.3%	0.8%	2.2%
Other	4.2%	3.3%	2.7%	2.7%
Education (Years and Degrees Completed)				
0-8 years	16.1%	29.0%	45.9%	40.1%
9-12 years no degree	43.5%	36.0%	33.5%	28.8%
HS graduate	24.6%	15.4%	9.5%	15.9%
Post-HS education	10.6%	14.7%	8.4%	11.3%
BA/BS or beyond	5.2%	5.0%	2.7%	4.0%

The typical respondent to the Emerging Latino Survey was a married woman in her late thirties, who was born abroad, had children, and who was working at the time of the survey. She had nine to twelve years of education, but had not completed high school. Her household income in 1995 was between $15,000 and $19,999.

Table 1.2 Household Incomes of Survey Respondents

	Colombian	Dominican	Guatemalan	Salvadoran
	%	%	%	%
Income Range				
Less than $9,999	14.3	28.6	24.5	17.9
$10,000 - $14,999	21.2	12.4	27.9	25.9
$15,000 - $19,999	11.5	11.6	12.2	16.3
$20,000 - $24,999	6.7	5.5	4.8	8.3
$25,000 - $29,999	11.5	4.6	4.5	3.5
$30,000 - $34,999	5.6	4.6	0.8	4.8
$35,000 - $39,999	1.6	2.8	1.9	1.6
$40,000 or more	4.5	4.6	3.2	3.2
Refused	23.1	25.3	20.2	18.7

The vast majority of the survey respondents were in the age groups that are likely to work, but because many were newer to the work force, they had higher than average rates of unemployment. Of those in the workforce, almost one in three worked two or more jobs at the time of the survey.

Of course, a summary like this masks many variations among respondents. Approximately four in ten respondents were men. The respondents ranged in age from 18 (the minimum age for inclusion in the survey) to 95. While approximately half of respondents were married, slightly more than one quarter had never been married. The vast majority of the survey respondents were in the age groups that are likely to work. Consequently, the survey respondents included a high share of adults in the workforce, but because many were newer to the workforce, they had higher than average rates of unemployment. Few of the respondents were retired or disabled workers. Of those in the workforce, almost one in three worked two or more jobs at the time of the survey. Almost three quarters of the respondents had children, though in some cases these children no longer lived in the household.

While the sample demonstrates that there are many similarities among the emerging Latino populations, it is important to note their differences. As is shown in Table 1.1, Colombian and Dominican respondents tended to be older than Salvadorans and Guatemalans. The sample includes a lower share of Dominican men than Salvadoran or Guatemalan men. Dominicans were also somewhat more likely to be U.S.-born, though overwhelmingly, the sample was comprised of the foreign born. Salvadoran and Guatemalan respondents were more likely to be married and less likely to be separated or divorced than were the Colombian and the Dominican respondents. Dominicans were somewhat less likely than any of the other populations to be working at the time of the survey and their rates of unemployment were

higher. Finally, Salvadorans and Guatemalans had less formal education than either Colombians or Dominicans — more than 40 percent had eight or fewer years of education compared to 16 percent of Colombians and 29 percent of Dominicans.

As would be predicted by these demographic characteristics, the emerging Latino populations had household incomes lower than the average for others in the United States (see Table 1.2). In 1995 (the most recent year for which data are available), the average household income in the United States was $34,076. Just 10 percent of the emerging Latino households included in the survey exceeded this level (though it is noteworthy that more than 21 percent of households refused to disclose information on income). Among those disclosing household income, Colombian households had the highest incomes, and Dominicans and Salvadorans, the lowest. Dominicans were the least likely to disclose their household incomes.

Survey respondents had household incomes lower than the averages for other residents of the United States.

Comparing the Survey Sample to the Emerging Latino Populations as a Whole

Across most of these demographic variables, the sample successfully represents the characteristics of the populations as a whole (or at least within these populations in the cities that we surveyed). The sample characteristics for marital status, work status, and parenthood closely resemble the populations as a whole. While the average ages may seem high, these averages are significantly affected by the fact that we chose to survey only adults. Consequently, while approximately one-third of emerging Latino populations are under 18, none of the survey respondents are in this age group.

The levels of completed education in the sample closely resemble the populations' characteristics at the lower levels, but the sample has fewer respondents with post-high school education. The survey's focus on census tracts with high concentrations of the populations under study (which is discussed in greater detail below) primarily accounts for this divergence; we were less likely to interview individuals who had completed advanced levels of education and had moved away from their co-nationals.

The sample does diverge from the populations as a whole with respect to several characteristics. The Colombian and Dominican samples included a higher share of women than do the populations as a whole. In both communities, there are more women than men, but not at the rates that are found in the sample. Because survey calls during

the day are more likely to reach women than men, researchers traditionally have a challenge with respect to obtaining a representative gender distribution. We tried to address this problem by placing calls at all hours of the day as well as during evenings and weekends and by randomizing whom we spoke to in the household. We achieved this randomization by conducting an inventory of all household members who met the ancestry or origin qualifications for participation in the survey and then randomly selecting the person to interview. Despite these efforts, our sample has a higher share of women than do the populations as a whole.

Our sample has a disproportionate share of female respondents.

Where the sample most diverged from population demographics is in nativity. The sample is much more likely to be foreign-born than are the populations as a whole. Our previous research indicates that in 1990 in New York and Northern New Jersey, 19 percent of Colombians and 28 percent of Dominicans were born in the United States (NALEO Educational Fund and Tomás Rivera Policy Institute 1997*a*). In Los Angeles, 17 percent of Guatemalans and 16 percent of Salvadorans were born in the United States (Tomás Rivera Policy Institute and NALEO Educational Fund 1997*a*). Most of the sample, on the other hand, was foreign-born. This divergence is attributable to our decision to conduct the survey only in census tracts that were 10 percent or more Colombian, Dominican, Guatemalan, or Salvadoran. In other words, the sample only captures individuals who live in these high-density neighborhoods. These ethnic enclaves are much more likely to be port-of-entry communities (Grebler, Moore, and Guzman 1970). As a result, the adults in these high-density census tracts were much more likely to be foreign-born.

Our survey sample particularly diverges from the overall population with respect to the disproportionately high number of foreign-born respondents. This divergence results primarily from our decision to conduct our survey only in census tracts with high densities of emerging Latino residents.

We limited the survey in this way for reasons of economy. We decided that it was more important to have a larger sample (allowing for analysis within each of the emerging Latino populations) than to collect a smaller sample that contained a more diverse (and more representative) sample of respondents. By focusing on the more concentrated communities, however, we were less likely to survey people from emerging Latino communities who do not live around their co-ethnics. As a result, we expected that the sample would include more immigrants than the populations as a whole. As we expected, the respondents were more likely to have the sociodemographic characteristics associated with immigrants. In other words, the survey included more adult respondents who were younger than the average in the

population as a whole, who made less money, with high labor force participation rates.

A second factor explaining the disproportionate share of the foreign-born in our sample is our focus on adults. Population data on these groups include the native-born children of immigrants. For populations such as these that are overwhelmingly made up of recent immigrants, people under 18 are much more likely to be U.S.-born than people over 18.

The fact that our survey sample included only respondents over age 18 also contributed to the disproportionate share of foreign-born in the sample.

Our sample, therefore, reflects the characteristics of the adult population more than the populations as a whole. Because of the overwhelming number of immigrants, however, it is important to examine immigration and settlement characteristics of the sample to see how these predominantly immigrant populations compare to the immigrants in the populations as a whole.

As indicated in the demographic profile, survey respondents were overwhelmingly foreign-born. Nativity, however, masks various legal statuses that immigrants can hold. As shown in Table 1.3, the overwhelming majority of immigrant survey respondents reported that they were permanent residents. Only in the Guatemalan community were a minority in this category.

Table 1.3 Immigration Status Among Foreign Born

	Colombian %	Dominican %	Guatemalan %	Salvadoran %
Immigration Status (Among Foreign Born)				
Permanent resident	60.7	71.5	41.6	50.9
Naturalized citizen	27.1	25.4	13.4	14.1
Neither permanent resident nor naturalized citizen	12.2	3.1	44.9	34.9

Note: We have no way of verifying these answers and suspect that the respondents overreported being either naturalized citizens or permanent residents. In a sample of 80 respondents who reported that they were either naturalized citizens or permanent residents, approximately 20 percent subsequently stated that they were neither when they were re-interviewed.

The immigration statuses of respondents included permanent residents, naturalized citizens, and residents who were undocumented or in temporary immigration statuses.

The next largest category was naturalized citizens, accounting for more than one-quarter of Colombians and Dominicans and approximately 14 percent of Salvadorans and Guatemalans. Finally, some respondents fit neither of these categories. Some of these respondents held temporary

immigration statuses, such as refugee, or among the Salvadorans and Guatemalans, Temporary Protected Status;[3] others were undocumented. The share of respondents who held temporary immigration statuses or were undocumented varied dramatically from just 3 percent of Dominicans to 45 percent of Guatemalans. We should note that we had no way of verifying immigrant respondents' self-reported immigration status. Because of the potential consequences of reporting one's status to an unknown person, we imagine that many undocumented immigrants reported that their status was legal.[4]

Among immigrants who had naturalized or had reported that they were permanent residents, most were recent immigrants (see Table 1.4). With the exception of Colombians, the majority of the Emerging Latino Survey respondents had migrated to the United States in 1986 or later. Colombians had a slightly longer average residence. Salvadorans and Guatemalans were the most likely to have immigrated in the ten years before the survey.

The most often mentioned reason for immigration among Colombians was to join family. Among the other three emerging Latino populations, the most often mentioned reason for immigration was "economic reasons." Salvadorans and, particularly Guatemalans, were also quite likely to mention fleeing political strife as having spurred immigration.

Table 1.4 Immigration Characteristics of Survey Respondents

	Colombian %	Dominican %	Guatemalan %	Salvadoran %
Immigration Year (Naturalized Citizens and Permanent Residents)				
Before 1965	1.7	5.6	0.0	0.5
1966-1980	36.2	26.3	11.2	7.3
1981-1985	20.3	15.2	14.2	14.1
1986-1990	15.1	23.6	37.3	46.9
1991-1997	26.8	29.3	37.3	31.3
Age at Immigration (Immigration to Reside "Permanently" in the United States)				
6 or younger	6.9	7.4	4.2	5.5
7-18	27.5	28.0	29.2	27.4
19-30	37.0	42.3	52.4	51.8
31 or older	28.5	22.3	14.2	15.3
Reason for Immigration				
Join family	34.6	33.8	16.2	16.7
Flee political strife	0.6	1.5	16.5	25.0
Flee communism	0.2	0.0	1.4	2.5
For job	7.6	10.6	7.1	9.7
Economic reasons	29.6	37.1	41.8	34.4
To go to school	5.2	4.4	3.6	1.7
Immigrated with family	8.3	7.2	7.4	4.2
Other	13.9	5.4	6.0	5.8

The most common age at which these immigrants arrived in the United States was between 19 and 30 years of age, a characteristic common in all immigrant communities. Few in the sample came as young children. Again, there were variations based on national origin. Colombians were slightly more likely than the other groups to immigrate when they had passed their thirtieth birthday.

Most immigrant respondents arrived in the United States between 19 and 30 years of age, a characteristic common in all immigrant communities.

The reasons for initial immigration to the United States varied somewhat with the respondent's national origin. The most often mentioned reason for immigration among Colombians was to join family. Among the other three emerging Latino populations, the most often mentioned reason for immigration was "economic reasons." Salvadorans and, particularly Guatemalans, were also quite likely to mention fleeing political strife as having spurred immigration.

Despite the short average period of residence in the United States, the majority of respondents from each national origin group reported that they spoke English either very well or well (see Table 1.5). The Colombians were the most likely to report that they spoke English very well; Salvadorans were the least likely. At the other end of the spectrum, between 6 percent (Colombians) and 13 percent (Dominicans) reported that they could not speak English at all.

Despite these reported abilities to speak English, given the choice, the vast majority of respondents chose to use Spanish for the interview. More than nine in ten respondents answered survey questions in Spanish. This rate of survey completion in Spanish is comparable to the one other national survey of Latino immigrants — the National Latino Immigrant Survey. In that survey, 87.4 percent elected to be interviewed in Spanish (Pachon and DeSipio 1994: 202).

Table 1.5 Language Ability and Language Use Among Emerging Latino Populations

	Colombian	Dominican	Guatemalan	Salvadoran
	%	%	%	%
Self-Reported Ability to Understand English				
Very well	35.5	22.6	18.1	22.9
Well	39.8	40.3	48.5	50.4
Not very well	18.7	24.2	24.8	18.9
Not at all	6.0	12.9	8.5	7.7
Language of Survey Interview				
English	12.4	7.8	2.4	6.4
Spanish	87.6	92.2	97.6	93.6

Despite the short average period of residence in the United States, the majority of respondents from each national origin group reported that they spoke English either very well or well.

Overwhelming majorities of survey respondents intended to reside permanently in the United States, one indicator of a strong attachment to this nation.

The emerging Latino populations reported a strong attachment to the United States that includes a nascent political attachment (see Table 1.6). Overwhelming majorities intended to reside permanently in the United States. These residential intentions were held equally by immigrants with permanent resident status and by those without permanent status. These findings also parallel those of the National Latino Immigrant Survey (Pachon and DeSipio 1994: 90).

Residential intention alone is a weak indicator of political attachment to the United States. A stronger indicator is the respondents' perspectives on where their political focus lies. Majorities of Colombians and Dominicans and near majorities of Salvadorans and Guatemalans reported that they follow the politics of the United States and their home country equally. Of those who reported that they primarily follow the politics of just one country, the vast majority follow U.S. politics exclusively. For each national-origin group, the share of respondents who were apolitical was larger than the share that primarily follow the politics of their home country. With one exception, the foregoing patterns did not differ for men and women. The exception was Salvadoran respondents, where men were considerably more likely than women to follow U.S. politics exclusively. As a result, a lower share of Salvadoran men followed the politics of both countries equally.

Majorities of Colombians and Dominicans and near majorities of Salvadorans and Guatemalans reported that they follow the politics of the United States and their home country equally. For each national-origin group, more respondents were apolitical than primarily follow the politics of their home country.

Table 1.6 Residential and Political Attachment to the United States

	Colombian %	Dominican %	Guatemalan %	Salvadoran %
Plans to Make a Permanent Home of the United States (Among Immigrants)				
Yes	90.3	93.1	87.0	88.2
No	9.7	6.9	13.0	11.8
Country of Political Focus				
Both countries equally	56.5	54.4	47.5	49.3
United States	21.8	30.6	28.6	32.6
Home country	9.0	4.8	6.7	6.7
Does not follow politics	12.6	10.2	17.2	11.4

It is more difficult to compare immigration and settlement characteristics of survey respondents to the populations as a whole than it is to compare their demographic characteristics. For many of the characteristics discussed,

there are no data sources that profile the emerging Latino populations as a whole. For example, there is no way to determine the share of the foreign-born in each of the populations who are neither permanent residents nor naturalized U.S. citizens. The two variables for which comparable data are available are year of immigration and self-evaluated language use. With respect to year of immigration, the characteristics of the sample population are quite consistent with those of the populations as a whole. In terms of self-evaluated language use, with the exception of Colombians, the sample respondents reported less English language proficiency than the populations as a whole (in the census). Colombians in the sample reported spoken English abilities that were very similar to those reported by the Colombians in the census.

Public Policy Needs and the Quality of Services Delivered

The public policy needs of emerging Latino populations reflect their immigrant status. Overwhelmingly, respondents identified problems such as language difficulties, discrimination, access to jobs, and immigration status as the most important issues facing their communities. However, among the different national-origin groups, the relative importance of these issues varied.

Because the emerging Latino populations in the survey are primarily comprised of the foreign-born, their public policy needs largely reflect concerns related to the process of immigrant social and economic adaptation. Overwhelmingly, respondents identified problems such as language difficulties, discrimination, access to jobs, and immigration status as the most important issues facing their communities. These four key issues were much more likely to be mentioned than issues such as crime (with the exception of the Colombians, who did mention crime among their community's top three issues), low levels of political representation, the lack of public services, and health care. These latter issues are more likely to appear in a comparable survey of the public policy needs of native-born U.S. citizens (de la Garza et al. 1992).

Reflecting the differences in the immigration experiences of these populations as well as the differences in their experiences in the United States, the most important issues and their relative importance for each community varied (see Table 2.1). While three of the four issues appeared as central to each of the communities (jobs are the fourth most mentioned issue facing the communities), their order and their frequency of mentions varied. Nearly one-third of Colombians, for example, identified discrimination as the most important issue facing the Colombian community. For Colombians, this was the most mentioned issue. For Dominicans and Guatemalans, on the other hand, language problems proved to be the most often mentioned. The consensus, however, is somewhat lower in the Dominican and Guatemalan communities. Just twenty percent of respondents in these communities identified language as the most pressing issue. Guatemalans were more likely to identify immigrant status as the most important issue facing their community than any other issue.

Table 2.1. Most Important Issues Facing Co-nationals in the United States (top three mentions)

Colombians (% mentioned)
1. Discrimination (29.2%)
2. Language problems (14.3%)
3. Crime (13.8%)

Dominicans (% mentioned)
1. Language problems (22.3%)
2. Discrimination (16.1%)
3. Immigration status (14.2%)

Guatemalans (% mentioned)
1. Language problems (19.9%)
2. Discrimination (16.5%)
3. Immigration status (15.4%)

Salvadorans (% mentioned)
1. Immigration status (22.1%)
2. Language problems (17.6%)
3. Discrimination (16.0%)

Men and women in the emerging Latino communities identified the same core issues as being most important to their communities. They did, however, place different levels of emphasis on some issues. For example, Colombian and Salvadoran women were much more likely than Colombian and Salvadoran men to identify discrimination as the most important issue facing their communities. Colombian men, on the other hand, were more likely than women to identify language problems. In the Dominican and Guatemalan communities, it was women who were more likely to identify language problems. Guatemalan men raised immigrant status issues more than did Guatemalan women, as did men in the Salvadoran community. While these gender-related differences indicate that men and women in the emerging Latino communities may have different needs, it is important to note that there are no consistent patterns in terms of identification of the most important issue facing these communities that divide men and women in all four populations.

There is no consistent pattern of gender-related differences with respect to identifying core community needs.

It is also important to note that more than 80 percent of the respondents from each of the national-origin groups identified a specific issue as being the most important, and thus did not offer the answer of "don't know." These responses offer further evidence that the emerging Latino populations are engaged with U.S. society and are concerned with the issues facing their communities. Colombians were the

Over 80 percent of respondents from each national-origin group were able to identify one specific issue as being the most important, suggesting that emerging Latino populations are engaged with U.S. society and concerned with the issues facing their communities.

most likely to identify a specific issue and the Guatemalans were the least likely.

When we asked these same respondents to identify the most important issue facing their children in the United States and the children of their co-ethnics in the United States, we found a higher level of consensus, but also a greater number of respondents who did not offer a specific answer. For Dominicans, Guatemalans, and Salvadorans, the most important issue facing co-national children was "inadequate schools." Approximately one quarter of the respondents identified inadequate schools as the most important issue facing children in the United States (see Table 2.2). Among Colombians, language problems were more likely to be mentioned, with inadequate schools coming in second.

For Dominicans, Guatemalans, and Salvadorans, the most important issue facing co-national children was "inadequate schools." Among Colombians, language problems were more likely to be mentioned, with inadequate schools coming in second.

Table 2.2. Most Important Issues Facing the Children of Co-nationals in the United States (top three mentions)

Colombians (% mentioned)
1. Language problems (19.1%)
2. Inadequate schools (14.4%)
3. Immigration status (7.3%)

Dominicans (% mentioned)
1. Inadequate schools (23.7%)
2. Language problems (12.0%)
3. Neighborhood crime (9.0%)

Guatemalans (% mentioned)
1. Inadequate schools (25.3%)
2. Language problems (12.5%)
3. Poverty (8.0%)

Salvadorans (% mentioned)
1. Inadequate schools (24.0%)
2. Poverty (8.8%)
3. Immigration status (8.5%)

While schools were the most common focus, this question of issues facing children in the community generated a higher level of inability to answer than did the question focusing on the most important issue faced by the community as a whole. Approximately one-quarter of Dominicans and Salvadorans and nearly one third of Colombians and Guatemalans could not identify a single issue that faced children in their communities. In part, this phenomenon may reflect the inexperience of childless people with the issues facing children.

Overwhelmingly, emerging Latino populations were willing to pay more taxes to improve service delivery in these areas identified as crucial to their co-ethnics. Between 55 and 60 percent of each population reported a willingness to *increase* their taxes. These are two to three times the rates of those who were not willing to increase their personal taxes. Arguably, this willingness to be taxed indicates a perception that government can address these problems, or at least address them better, if it had sufficient resources.

Overwhelmingly, emerging Latino populations were willing to pay more taxes to improve service delivery in these areas identified as crucial to their co-ethnics. Across all four populations, men were more willing to increase their taxes than were women.

Across all four populations, men were more willing to increase their taxes to pay for new services than were women. Of all the national-origin groups, Salvadoran men were the most supportive of increased taxes; more than 75 percent reported that they would be more willing to pay more taxes for enhanced delivery of services. While the respondent women were more willing than not to raise taxes, support among Latinas in each community hovered around 50 percent.

In addition to the questions about needed services and the willingness to pay taxes, we asked California respondents about a specific public policy — Proposition 187. In the 1994 elections, California voters passed Proposition 187 by a margin of approximately two to one. Latino voters opposed the proposition by comparable margins. Although the federal courts have delayed most of the implementation of the proposition, Proposition 187 sought to deny state-funded services, particularly education and health services, to undocumented immigrants.

We asked California respondents, most of whom were not citizens and could not vote in the 1994 elections, about their support for the proposition. Proposition 187 was more strongly opposed in the Salvadoran and Guatemalan communities than it was by California Latino voters as a whole. Just 6.3 percent of Guatemalans and 4.6 percent of Salvadorans supported the objectives of the proposition.

In California, Salvadoran and Guatemalan respondents were more strongly opposed to Proposition 187 than were California Latino voters as a whole.

Public Services Use By Emerging Latino Populations

In this section, we will profile what services emerging Latino populations used and their attitudes toward the quality of services received. This discussion has three parts. We

begin by reporting respondent attitudes toward the *most* important service received. In this section, we indicate that the plurality of respondents did not identify a single program as most important. We then report on use and satisfaction of a variety of public services accessible to most of these populations. This discussion examines those services provided to all residents, such as fire and police protection, sanitation, and recreation, as well as government assistance programs where benefits are provided only to recipients who meet certain criteria. The latter category includes both public assistance programs for low-income residents ("needs-based services"), as well as public programs such as Social Security retirement benefits, where eligibility is based on the contributions of the recipient ("contributory government programs"). With respect to all services examined in the survey, we find that all respondents relied on some of them and that they were generally pleased with the quality of the service received. Consistent with other studies of immigrant service utilization, we also find that generally, few in the emerging Latino populations receive benefits from needs-based services or contributory government programs. This results in part from the ineligibility of some respondents for programs as a result of their immigration status. Finally, we conclude by examining respondents' perceptions of discrimination as a possible barrier to the delivery of public services.

Most Important Public Service

When respondents were asked about the most important public service received, the most common answer was none. We believe this response may indicate difficulty in distinguishing among or measuring the importance of various services.

The focus of our study — the public policy needs of the emerging Latino populations — was not necessarily one that resonated with many of the respondents to the survey. When asked about the most important public service received, the most common answer was "none" (see Table 2.3). This answer could have several meanings. We begin, however, with what we believe that it does not mean. As we have suggested, this does not mean that emerging Latino populations are disengaged from U.S. society. Instead, it may indicate a difficulty in distinguishing public from private services or, alternatively, it may reflect a difficulty in measuring the importance of one service over another. Finally, it could have been an artifact of the design of the survey. In order to measure the single most important service in these communities, we designed this question such that the respondent had to volunteer an answer without the interviewer reading a list of possible services. As a result, the answers to this question reflect un-prompted answers.

Table 2.3 Most Important Public Service Received, Ranked by Overall Number of Mentions

	Colombian	Dominican	Guatemalan	Salvadoran
	%	%	%	%
Service Mentioned				
None	42.4	34.1	40.4	37.1
Public schools	22.9	23.7	30.1	34.7
Health services	17.4	18.7	15.4	19.2
Welfare/public assistance	4.5	10.4	2.9	2.4
Don't know/ refused	3.8	3.3	5.9	3.5
Other	4.4	3.2	3.0	2.4
Supplemental Security Income	4.0	1.4	0.5	0.0
Veteran's benefits	0.3	3.6	0.3	0.0
AFDC	0.3	1.5	1.6	0.8

For each of the four populations under study, the public service that the highest number of respondents mentioned as most important was public schools followed by health services.

For each of the four populations under study, the public service that the highest number of respondents mentioned as most important was public schools followed by health services. Guatemalans were the most likely to identify one of these two services as the most important service received.

After public schools and health services, respondents identified federal cash and benefit service programs as the most important. However, few respondents identified any of these needs-based programs.

After these two services, respondents identified four cash and service benefit programs mandated by the federal government — welfare/public assistance, Supplemental Security Income, veteran's benefits, and Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC).[5] Dominicans were the most likely to identify one of these four programs as the most important public service received and Guatemalans the least likely. However, as noted above, consistent with existing research on immigrant benefit program utilization, overall, few respondents identified any of these needs-based programs.

In terms of the most important public service received, we did identify some differences based on gender. Colombian and Dominican women were more likely than Colombian and Dominican men to identify health services as the most important. Dominican men were more likely to state that none of the services received was the most important. In the Guatemalan community, women were much more likely to identify schools as being the most important service received, while the men were more likely to state that no service was

In general, men were more likely than women to identify no public service as being the most important.

important. In answering this question, clearer gender-related patterns appear. There does not appear to be a clear explanation for the greater tendency of men to state that no particular service was important. It is possible that men use the public services less frequently or are less aware of the services they use. It also possible that men do not perceive important or memorable distinctions between the services they utilize.

Use of Public Services and Satisfaction with Service Delivery

Despite their inability to identify a single public service program as "most important," respondents reported that they used a range of public services. This depth of use, however, varied from service to service. Where almost all had used public transportation, received municipal garbage pickup, and visited public parks, a much lower percentage received public welfare services or unemployment benefits.

Despite this inability to identify a single program as "most important," respondents reported that they used a range of public services. This depth of use, however, varied from service to service. Where almost all had used public transportation, received municipal garbage pickup, and visited public parks, a much lower percentage received public welfare services or unemployment benefits (see Table 2.4). Use of services also varied by national origin. Dominicans and Guatemalans were more likely to have used needs-based services such as welfare than were Colombians. Across the range of services, Salvadorans reported that they were the least likely to have utilized public services. We did not find significant differences in service utilization between men and women.

Table 2.4. Reported Use of Specific Public Services in Emerging Latino Communities (percentage reporting that they have used the service), Ranked by Overall Levels of Use

	Colombian %	Dominican %	Guatemalan %	Salvadoran %
Service Used				
Trash	94.5	96.6	90.9	91.6
Public transportation	96.4	96.1	85.8	84.6
Public recreation	93.2	86.3	85.9	87.7
Immigration and Naturalization Service	81.1	90.3	83.7	89.9
Public health and hospitals	86.5	90.6	73.1	81.6
Schools	73.7	77.7	70.0	78.1
Adult education	70.0	69.6	69.7	76.0
Police	72.1	72.6	66.5	69.1
Fire protection	63.7	63.6	53.5	56.2
Welfare	45.6	68.8	44.4	53.5
Unemployment insurance	43.0	56.5	40.0	54.0

The high level of public transportation use needs to be noted. The two metropolitan areas under study have significantly different levels of public transportation availability. Despite these metropolitan differences, these emerging Latino populations relied at high levels on mass transportation, with three out of four Salvadorans and Guatemalans responding that they used public transportation in an area where such services have traditionally been difficult to use.

Notwithstanding the significant differences between the availability of public transportation in New York compared to Los Angeles, emerging Latino residents in both areas reported high levels of public transportation use.

This diverse range of possible government services masks two important phenomena. First, it is important to note that most of these services are provided by local governments. Thus, what we are really identifying are the public services available in New York and Los Angeles. Second, while many respondents have not used many of the individual services mentioned, all respondents had used some of these services and no respondent had used all of the services under study. Thus, these public services and the people who provide them offer a connection between U.S. society and these largely immigrant populations. The evidence presented here indicates, then, that these are not isolated populations, but instead individuals who are connected to U.S. society and availing themselves of the resources it provides. It is important to place this finding in the context of the willingness to raise taxes to provide needed services.

Among those who reported receiving individual services, most were satisfied with the quality of services received (see Table 2.5). The majority reported that the quality was either excellent or good. Only small shares reported that service delivery was either fair or poor. The perception of the quality of the service delivered did vary by national origin, with Dominicans generally reporting the lowest satisfaction with service quality. Respondents clearly made distinctions among municipal services. Generally, fire protection services received the highest evaluations among all four groups. In contrast, police and public recreation services received the lowest ratings.

Among the respondents who reported utilizing public services, most were satisfied with the quality of services received. The majority reported that the quality was either excellent or good.

Fire protection and adult education services received the highest ratings for quality of public services. On the other hand, public recreation, police services and unemployment insurance were the least likely to receive high ratings.

Table 2.5. Quality of Public Services Received Among Respondents Reporting that They Have Received the Service (percentage reporting that the quality was good or excellent), Ranked by Overall Levels of Satisfaction

	Colombian	Dominican	Guatemalan	Salvadoran
	%	%	%	%
Service				
Fire protection	89.5	88.4	94.4	94.1
Adult education	84.4	62.5	80.5	77.9
Schools	69.5	65.4	74.4	72.3
Trash	72.1	69.5	62.0	67.4
Welfare	70.8	62.5	71.8	66.0
Immigration and Naturalization Service	70.7	66.0	61.2	60.0
Public health and hospitals	70.3	59.9	60.9	64.2
Public transportation	80.0	56.8	60.5	56.6
Public recreation	62.6	50.3	66.1	64.9
Police	64.1	55.8	53.2	55.3
Unemployment insurance	54.4	46.7	50.8	50.0
Average among respondents who have used services	71.7	62.2	66.9	66.2

Note: In each case, we present the satisfaction measure for respondents who have used each of the services (see Table 2.4).

The generally favorable view of public service delivery in the United States came despite a perception among approximately half of respondents that language was a barrier in the delivery of services.

The generally favorable view of public service delivery in the United States came despite a perception among approximately half of respondents that language was a barrier in the delivery of services. The level at which emerging Latino populations identified language as a problem varied considerably, however, from national-origin group to national-origin group. Almost 63 percent of Colombians reported that language was a barrier in obtaining services. This exceeded the rates for Guatemalans (51.3 percent), Salvadorans (41.8 percent), and Dominicans (41.7 percent). The concern about language as a barrier to public service delivery was particularly evident among Colombian women; however, there were no significant gender differences in the perceptions of language barriers in the other emerging Latino populations.

Majorities in all communities used a combination of English and Spanish to obtain services. This bilingualism in

service delivery was the experience of approximately three quarters of respondents. Few received services solely in Spanish (between 5 and 7 percent) and slightly more received services solely in English (9 to 15 percent).

Majorities in all communities used a combination of English and Spanish to obtain services.

Needs-Based Services. With the possible exception of Dominicans, few in the emerging Latino populations received benefits from programs targeted to the poor (see Table 2.6). The generally low level of needs-based service utilization by the emerging Latino populations in part reflects the ineligibility of some respondents for these programs as a result of their immigration status. These ineligible respondents would include all undocumented immigrants and some of the recent permanent resident immigrants (this eligibility has recently changed for most permanent residents, but they were eligible at the time of the survey).[6] Refugees are eligible for many government benefit programs, though this policy too is in flux at this writing. The most used needs-based program is Medicaid, followed by food stamps and educational assistance. Again, there was variation by national origin in use of these programs with Guatemalans somewhat less likely to utilize them and Dominicans more likely.

With the possible exception of Dominicans, few in the emerging Latino populations received benefits from programs targeted to the poor, in part reflecting the ineligibility of some respondents for these programs as a result of their immigration status.

Table 2.6. Receipt of Benefits from Government Programs Targeted to the Poor, Ranked by Number of Respondents Reporting Use of the Service

	Colombian	Dominican	Guatemalan	Salvadoran
	%	%	%	%
Service				
Medicaid	13.7	40.4	13.6	11.9
Food stamps	11.7	31.9	11.1	10.3
Educational assistance	14.2	13.7	4.6	9.0
AFDC	1.5	11.3	4.9	8.4
Supplemental Security Income	2.2	8.1	3.3	3.3
Housing subsidy	0.8	9.0	2.2	2.7

Contributory Government Programs. Few in the emerging Latino community received benefits from contributory government programs (see Table 2.7). This reflects both the recentness of arrival of many in the emerging Latino communities and their youth. As recent arrivals, they had not worked long enough to become eligible for Social Security or Medicare. As working-age adults, they were not yet eligible, regardless of their years in the workforce.

Because our respondents were generally young or recent immigrants, few had worked long enough or were old enough to receive benefits from contributory government programs.

Table 2.7 Receipt of Benefits from Contributory Government Programs, Ranked by Number of Respondents Reporting Use of the Service

	Colombian %	Dominican %	Guatemalan %	Salvadoran %
Service				
Medicare	9.6	11.6	9.6	7.9
Social Security	7.3	12.1	7.6	6.0
Veteran's benefits	0.3	0.5	0.0	0.5

In our earlier research, community leaders had expressed concerns about the quality of police services received in their communities; however, less than one-third of respondents reported a perception that police treated Anglos differently from their co-nationals, suggesting that most do not see a significant police relations problem.

Police and Schools. After examining the results of the focus groups conducted with community leaders during the second stage of the project, we wanted to probe more deeply on the quality of services that respondents receive from two specific public agencies — the police and the public schools. In both cases, the community elites identified these agencies as particularly important, but also particularly problematic for these communities. At the mass level, respondents echo the importance of the schools, although they report satisfaction with the services received. The police (and crime in general) were less of a mass concern.

In terms of police services, less than one-third of respondents reported a perception that Anglos were treated differently from their co-nationals by the police. Guatemalans were the most likely to perceive differential treatment and Salvadorans the least likely.

We asked respondents who reported that there was differential police treatment based on ethnicity to suggest why there was this difference. The most frequent explanation was "discrimination" (this issue is discussed in more detail in "Perceptions of Discrimination" below). Respondents also mentioned racial tension and stereotyping of their co-ethnics. Salvadorans were most likely to identify racial tension as a problem; Colombians and Dominicans were the most likely to mention stereotyping as a problem (a finding that echoes the Colombian and Dominican leaders' perceptions identified in the focus groups). While important, these findings must be placed in context. Just one-third of respondents perceived that their co-ethnics were treated differently by the police than Anglos, so most do not see a problem in police-community relations.

In terms of schools, we wanted to measure the respondents' perceptions of parental involvement. Leaders expressed

concerns that parents were insufficiently involved in the schools and that this reduced the quality of the schools. At the mass levels, these concerns were not shared. More than eight in ten reported that parents *are* involved in the schools. These perceptions were reinforced by the respondents' reports of their own school-based activities. More than six in ten of the parents had met with their children's teachers. Dominicans had the highest rate of such meetings (69.3 percent). Emerging Latino community members also had high rates of attendance at PTA meetings. Nearly 60 percent had attended a PTA meeting; in this activity, Guatemalans showed the highest rates of PTA attendance (60.5 percent). Although participation was not as strong as in PTAs, parents were also involved in other school activities. More than 43 percent have met the principal of their child's school, 27 percent have attended a school board meeting, and 21 percent have voted in a school board election. In New York, non-citizens may vote in school board elections; nearly 30 percent of Dominicans had used this privilege.

Community leaders also expressed concerns that emerging Latino parents were insufficiently involved in their children's schools. However, among our respondents, more than eight in ten reported that parents are involved in the schools.

Participation in parental activities at schools increases dramatically among emerging Latino immigrants who have resided in the United States for longer periods. These patterns appear across all four emerging Latino populations. For example, in terms of meeting with the teacher, more than 75 percent of immigrant parents with fifteen years of residence or more have undertaken this activity.[7] Although there was some national origin variation (ranging from 68 percent of Salvadoran parents to 81 percent of Guatemalan parents), the long-term residents are much more likely to have met with their children's teachers than are more recent immigrant parents.

Participation in parental activities at schools increases dramatically among emerging Latino immigrants who have resided in the United States for longer periods.

Emerging Latino parents with greater lengths of residence were also more likely to have been involved in other school activities. Approximately 70 percent of parents with 15 years of residence or more had attended PTA meetings compared to about 55 percent of parents with 6 to 14 years of residence and 40 percent for parents with five or fewer years of residence.[8] More than half of the long-term residents had met with their children's school principal compared to just 30 percent of the immigrants with five or fewer years of residence.

Across all four emerging Latino populations, women were more likely to have participated in these school activities than the men. Nearly two-thirds of Dominican and Guatemalan women, for example, had attended PTA meetings.

Women were more likely to have participated in school-related activities than were men.

Women were also more active in meeting with school principals and attending school board meetings.

With respect to attitudes towards the schools, one final measure supports our finding that there is a gap between elite opinions voiced in the focus group interviews in the second stage of our research and the mass perceptions revealed by this survey. As noted above, we added extra questions about the satisfaction with the schools based on the results of the focus groups with community leaders. When asked about satisfaction with the quality of English language instruction in the schools, more than 60 percent of respondents rated the quality either "excellent" or "good," with approximately 15 percent reporting that they could not evaluate the quality of the instruction.

Survey respondents were generally satisfied with the quality of English language instruction in their schools, a finding that contradicts concerns expressed by community leaders.

This high level of satisfaction with the quality of English language instruction in the schools may seem to contradict a finding reported earlier, specifically that for Dominicans, Guatemalans, and Salvadorans the most important issue facing children in their communities was "inadequate schools" (also reported in Table 2.2; inadequate schools was the second most important issue facing children in the Colombian community after language problems). Respondents who identified inadequate schools as the most important issue facing children in their communities were less likely than the respondents as a whole to believe that English language instruction was adequate. Thus, respondents were likely to be consistent in their answers, but there is disagreement in each of the four national-origin groups about the quality of English instruction in the schools.

Each of these communities identify English language skills as a core public policy need. Thus, the differences between the perceptions of the community elites and the community members regarding the level of parental involvement, as well as the differing perceptions within the emerging Latino communities regarding the quality of English language instruction, should be explored in greater depth in the future. Perhaps, satisfaction with the schools is in flux and we may be see an emerging trend of greater dissatisfaction with schools in the coming years.

Perceptions of Discrimination

While the majority of the emerging Latino populations perceived that there was discrimination in the United States, equally large majorities reported that they do not feel that they themselves were the personal targets of discrimination

by specific government offices (see Table 2.8). While this finding may seem to be contradictory, it echoes previous research on perceptions of discrimination in Latino communities. Two previous studies of Latino communities — the Latino National Political Survey and the National Latino Immigrant Survey — have found a similar pattern (de la Garza et al. 1992: Tables 7.5, 7.6, and 7.10-7.12; Pachon and DeSipio 1994: Tables 5.1-5.3).

Table 2.8 Perceptions of Discrimination in the United States

	Colombian %	Dominican %	Guatemalan %	Salvadoran %
Perceptions of Discrimination Against Respondent's Co-Nationals				
Yes	74.1	62.2	59.7	64.7
No	13.9	23.6	23.5	19.7
Not Sure	12.0	14.2	16.8	15.6
Frequency of Discrimination Against Respondent's Family				
Most of the time	12.9	16.6	26.0	18.0
Some of the time	19.8	17.1	19.7	22.7
Only now and then	13.8	16.3	17.0	17.7
Hardly at all	13.7	17.4	15.3	17.5
Never	39.8	32.6	21.9	24.1
Discrimination by **Police** Against Respondent				
Yes	8.7	8.9	11.0	9.9
No	91.3	91.1	89.0	90.1
Discrimination by **School Officials** Against Respondent				
Yes	6.0	4.2	6.1	8.2
No	94.0	95.8	93.9	91.8
Discrimination by **Government Offices** Against Respondent				
Yes	4.2	9.7	8.3	8.9
No	95.8	90.3	91.7	91.1
Discrimination in **Renting or Buying Home** Against Respondent				
Yes	8.7	7.5	9.1	7.3
No	91.3	92.5	90.9	92.7
Other Discrimination Against Respondent				
Yes	9.1	9.6	12.6	12.9
No	90.9	90.4	87.4	87.1

Majorities of each of the national origin groups reported that their co-nationals experienced discrimination.

These previous studies showed that while Latinos perceive that either Latinos generally or their co-nationals/co-ethnics were the frequent targets of discrimination, many fewer perceived that they or their families had been subject

When asked specifically about experiences of discrimination against their families, a minority of each population reported that such discrimination occurs "most of the time" or "some of the time."

to discrimination. Among those who reported discrimination against themselves or their families, the majority reported that it was infrequent. The Emerging Latino Survey reinforces these previous findings. Majorities of each of the national origin groups reported that their co-nationals experienced discrimination. Colombians were the most likely to report ethnic-based discrimination. When the focus narrows to the respondents' families, however, the share reporting that discrimination occurs "most of the time" or "some of the time" decreased considerably. Ranging from a low of 33 percent among Colombians to a high of 46 percent among Salvadorans, the share reporting discrimination of these frequencies against their families was lower than those reporting discrimination against their co-nationals. Between one-fifth and two-fifths reported that their families "never" experienced discrimination. Yet, these findings should not obscure that more than one out of three respondents in the emerging Latino communities had experienced discrimination in their families.

When the focus further narrows to discrimination by agencies that deliver key public services, such as the police, school officials, or government offices, the share reporting having personally experienced discrimination declines even further. The rates reported for "other government offices" were slightly higher, but even in this broad category, no more than one in eight of any of the national origin groups reported having experienced discrimination from any of these agencies. In these questions about discrimination by specific government agencies, Salvadorans and Guatemalans were slightly more likely to report having experienced discrimination than were Colombians and Dominicans.

The foregoing patterns of perception of discrimination are largely consistent between men and women. In fact, the differences based on national origin are consistently greater than those based on gender. There is only one exception to this pattern. Salvadoran men are somewhat more likely than Salvadoran women to report having experienced discrimination by the police. Even among Salvadoran men, however, just 17 percent report having been the target of such discrimination.

In previous studies of Latinos, the perceptions of discrimination tended to be greater among more established Latinos, such as the U.S.-born and the more affluent. One possible explanation for these findings is that recent immigrants have low expectations for how they will be treated by

others in U.S. society and, hence, do not recognize discrimination when they are its targets. If this understanding of immigrants and discrimination were true, immigrants would have developed expectations about interaction with others and then come, increasingly, to recognize discrimination. The data from the Emerging Latino Survey offer contradictory evidence, and do not appear to substantiate this understanding of immigrants and discrimination.

Previous studies of Latinos suggest that perceptions of discrimination tend to be greater among more established Latinos, such as the U.S. born and more affluent. An examination of the perceptions of discrimination of longer-term residents from our survey offers contradictory evidence, and does not appear to substantiate this understanding of discrimination.

Among Colombians and Guatemalans, perceptions of discrimination against the respondent and his/her family members were lower among those immigrant respondents with 15 or more years of residence compared to those with five or fewer years of residence. Among Salvadorans, the perceptions of discrimination against family were roughly the same among different length of residence cohorts. In the Dominican community, on the other hand, perceptions of discrimination increased with length of residence.

In answer to the more general question about discrimination against co-nationals in the United States, in three communities (Dominicans, Guatemalans, and Salvadorans), perceptions of discrimination were roughly equal within each length of residence cohort. On the other hand, Colombians with longer periods of residence (15 years or more) were more likely to perceive that their co-nationals were the targets of discrimination than those with less than five years of residence or with six to fourteen years of residence. The foregoing findings indicate that no consistent pattern linking increased length of residence with increased perceptions of discrimination exists across national-origin groups.

The inconsistent or contradictory nature of these findings suggest that for the emerging Latino communities, the process of acculturation is not one that necessarily includes a greater exposure to or awareness of discrimination. Consequently, as noted above, our findings support those of previous studies that indicate that Latinos generally perceive that discrimination against their co-nationals is common, but they are substantially less likely to perceive that they or their families have been its victim. However, our findings do not suggest that more established Latinos will tend to have greater perceptions of such discrimination.

The low rates of perceived personal, family or public service agency discrimination should not obscure our overall finding of the much higher levels of general discrimination

Our respondents did not perceive substantial discrimination by public service agencies, which suggests that their low level of public service utilization does not result from fear of mistreatment. However, these perceptions should not obscure the much higher level of discrimination respondents reported against their co-ethnics.

that respondents perceive against their co-ethnics. More objective measures demonstrate that discrimination in U.S. society is pervasive. What is important about these findings is that concerns about facing discrimination do not appear to hinder individuals from these communities in seeking services. Thus, the low rates of utilization we have identified for some services are not due to fear of mistreatment.

Community Public Policy Needs: Mass and Elite Opinion

As we have indicated, we designed the Emerging Latino Survey based on extensive focus group interviews with the leaders of community-based organizations in each of these four communities. These discussions with community leaders highlighted areas of particular interaction between these communities and governments and offered key insights to the community's public policy needs. In our discussion in this report of police and schools, we highlighted two areas in which these community leaders identified specific community needs. In this section, we want to make a more comprehensive comparison of the public policy needs identified by leaders and those identified by the populations as a whole. As we found in the discussion of police and schools, although there is much evidence to substantiate the leaders' perceptions, their views do not always match those of the communities as a whole.

We have analyzed the issues identified by organizational leaders in the emerging Latino populations separately (NALEO Educational Fund and Tomás Rivera Policy Institute 1997*b* and Tomás Rivera Policy Institute and NALEO Educational Fund 1997*b*). To summarize the findings in these reports, leaders identified both obstacles experienced by these communities in their abilities to influence government outcomes as well as the need for specific services. Overall, the leaders were much more focused on the obstacles, such as a perceived distance between Salvadorans and Guatemalans and local elected officials or barriers to political participation reported by Colombians and Dominican leaders. Salvadoran and Guatemalan leaders also reported low rates of U.S. citizenship, the absence of correct information about citizenship, and workplace exploitation as issues of importance to their communities. Colombian and Dominicans leaders also identified several barriers: lack of economic

development, obstacles faced in the search for incorporation into U.S. society, and discrimination. Leaders from all four communities also identified several specific public policy issues: education, police-community relations, and the delivery of public services in general.

U.S. Citizenship and Naturalization

When the attitudes and experiences of the individual respondents to the Emerging Latino Survey are examined, there is evidence of some of the barriers identified by community leaders, and some respondents also recognize the effects of these obstacles. In particular, respondents recognized the importance of U.S. citizenship and evidenced a desire to apply for U.S. citizenship within the year after the survey was conducted.

Both community leaders and community members addressed concerns about obstacles to political incorporation.

Among permanent resident respondents, eighty percent or more of each national origin group reported that becoming a U.S. citizen was "very important." Few respondents responded that obtaining citizenship was either "not very important" or "not at all important." Respondents' intentions to take action with respect to naturalization were very consistent with their attitudes towards U.S. citizenship. Even larger majorities of permanent resident respondents (between 78 percent of Guatemalans and 88 percent of Dominicans) reported that they planned to apply for naturalization within the year after the survey. While actual applications at this rate seem unlikely based on previous research on naturalization, this desire to obtain U.S. citizenship undoubtedly reflects at the mass level what the elites were also concerned with — low rates of citizenship in the emerging Latino communities.

Community members recognized the importance of U.S. citizenship, and large majorities of permanent resident respondents reported that they planned to apply for naturalization within a year after the survey.

We did not specifically explore the concern raised by leaders about the absence of accurate information about citizenship. Respondents, however, did not report that concerns that the naturalization exam would be hard or that the Immigration and Naturalization Service would potentially mistreat them were particularly salient reasons for not applying for naturalization. As indicated in Table 2.5, the Immigration and Naturalization Service is one of the lower ranked public service delivery agencies. That said, majorities in each community rate its delivery of services as good or excellent. Although we can not determine the final answer to this question from a single survey, if respondents who intend to naturalize are not successful in their future efforts, their experience may reinforce the leaders' concerns about the absence of correct information about citizenship in the community.

Perceptions of Discrimination and Barriers to Incorporation

As we have indicated, at the mass level there is a perception of discrimination against co-nationals, but that this discrimination does not extend to the individual respondent (or his/her family) (see Table 2.8). Thus, the leaders' concerns about discrimination are substantiated at the mass level, in part. This finding must be balanced, however, with the recognition that individuals did not report experiencing discrimination and that the reported rates of discrimination by specific public agencies (police, school officials, "government offices," and the housing market) were quite low.

A concern related both to naturalization and discrimination among the leaders was obstacles faced in the search for incorporation into U.S. society. For example, leaders expressed concerns that the Immigration and Naturalization Service is a barrier that community members must surmount in the naturalization process, or that the inadequate delivery of services hindered the progress of community members. The survey indicates that the vast majority of respondents do not perceive that such barriers are responsible for the challenges they face in becoming a part of U.S. society. They see many opportunities and perceive that public services are being delivered in an acceptable manner. We return to this theme in the report's conclusion. Considering that a substantial minority of the respondents were either undocumented or in temporary resident statuses that could end, this is a particularly remarkable finding.

Our findings suggest that our survey respondents do not view discrimination or inadequate service delivery as being a primary cause for the challenges they face in becoming part of U.S. society.

Political Participation

The leaders' concerns about low levels of political participation are substantiated by the individual-level findings. As the leaders recognized, this lack of participation can be explained by low levels of U.S. citizenship in these communities. The number of U.S. citizen respondents is relatively low, so we can only tentatively examine voting among citizens, but we find that self-reported registration and voting rates are broadly comparable to those of the Latino community as a whole (which trail those of the population as a whole). Approximately three quarters of the citizen respondents were registered to vote. Turnout among the registered in the most-recent state election (again based on self-reporting) varied by national origin, from a high of 75 percent among Colombians to a low of 54 percent among Salvadorans. Traditionally, self-reported voter registration and turnout rates exceed actual rates by as much as 20 percent. Even if our

findings do not reflect precise levels of actual registration and turnout, it is safe to say that the participation rates of survey respondents substantiate the concerns expressed by the leaders. However, it is important to note again that the low participation rates of respondents are comparable to those of Latinos as a whole, and are not specific to the emerging Latino communities.

Community leaders expressed concerns about the low level of political participation in their communities, which they explain by the low level of U.S. citizenship. These concerns are substantiated by the low rates of voting and registration by community members, although such rates are comparable to those of the Latino community as a whole.

Clearly, registration and voting are just one way in which a cohesive community can influence politics. In our conclusion, we examine other forms political activity, including those available to non-U.S. citizens.

Delivery of Services

As we have already indicated, survey respondents have somewhat different views than the community elites about the delivery of specific services. The majority of respondents did not report a problem with police-community relations (with a substantial minority — approximately one-third — reporting that their co-ethnics were mistreated by the police). Education, specifically, and public services in general received favorable ratings by the majority of respondents (see Table 2.5). In terms of education, the survey respondents, much more than the elites, reported high levels of parental involvement in the schools. Again, however, these differences between elite and mass opinion may reflect greater knowledge, greater experience, or higher expectations on the parts of the organizational leaders. Additionally, the perceptions of leaders may be shaped by experiences that are not shared by the emerging Latino community members. For example, leaders may have more contact than community members with individuals who have encountered problems with service delivery or treatment by government officials.

The differences between elite and mass opinions with respect to police relations and parental school involvement may reflect the greater knowledge and experience, or the higher expectations of community leaders.

Other Concerns Identified by Community Leaders

The focus of the survey on the public policy needs and quality of service delivery in the emerging Latino communities precludes a discussion of the final areas identified as important by community elites — economic development and workplace exploitation. We also do not have specific measures of another concern raised by community leaders — the distance between emerging Latino populations and local elected officials, which the leaders believed was demonstrated by the lack of responsiveness of those officials. As indicated in Table 2.8, few emerging Latinos reported discrimination by government offices. Certainly, however, lack of responsiveness by elected officials can be demonstrated by activities

Community leaders expressed concerns about the lack of responsiveness of local elected officials; in comparison, few community members reported discrimination by government officials. However, lack of responsiveness by elected officials can be demonstrated by activities which were not measured by our survey.

other than discrimination which were not measured by our survey.

In sum, the concerns of community elites find substantiation in the experiences of Emerging Latino Survey respondents, particularly in terms of obstacles faced by these populations. In terms of the delivery of specific services, however, emerging Latino populations reported broad satisfaction. As noted above, this difference may reflect greater knowledge, greater experience, or higher expectations on the parts of the organizational leaders, as well as more frequent contact with community members who have encountered the obstacles perceived by those leaders.

Conclusions

The results of the Emerging Latino Survey potentially offer both encouragement and challenges for policy makers. On the positive side, the survey demonstrates convincingly that Latinos who trace their ancestry or origin to Colombia, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, or Guatemala, like the Latino community as a whole, are becoming active participants in American society. They are aware of issues facing their communities, they follow U.S. politics, they have a set of expectations for the delivery of public services in the United States, and they perceive that they are not subject to discrimination. As a consequence of this, they are utilizing public services in the communities in which they reside. When they use these services, they are frequently satisfied with their quality.

Our survey demonstrates convincingly that emerging Latino residents, like the Latino community as a whole, are becoming active participants in American society.

As policy makers look to the future, however, they should be concerned that the services utilized by these emerging Latino communities are not necessarily addressing the issues that these communities consider fundamental to their collective future. While they use many municipal services and are pleased with the quality, they are not gaining access to services that they report they most need — services that will facilitate their political, social, and economic incorporation into U.S. society. These types of services are frequently the responsibility of the federal government, which is less accessible to the emerging Latino populations.

Policymakers should be concerned that the services being utilized by the emerging Latino communities are not necessarily addressing the issues that these communities consider fundamental to their future.

What we find, then, is that the use of public services in these communities is more reactive than proactive. Just 19 percent of respondents, for example, reported that they had contacted the government at any level within the twelve months prior to the survey about a problem or to get help or information. Among those who did, the most frequently mentioned reasons for the contact was to get information about U.S. citizenship or immigration status, medical care, and welfare. While their numbers were small, a near majority of those who contacted government

(48.5 percent) were "very satisfied" with the outcome of the contact. Thus, relatively few took the initiative to contact government, but when they did the outcome was often positive.

Among immigrant respondents, longer term residents were more likely to contact government agencies than those with shorter periods of residency.

Among immigrants in the emerging Latino populations, the likelihood of contact with government agencies increased with length of residence. Levels of satisfaction with the results of these contacts did not increase over the levels for the population as a whole. In part, this is a function of the relatively small number of respondents who contacted government. Many of those who did were these longer term residents (those with 15 years of residence or more) so their experiences strongly shaped the overall results of this question.

To bridge the gap between the needs of community members for salient public services and government's lack of incentive to provide those services, emerging Latino populations may need to utilize community-based organization, political mobilization and organized demand-making.

Clearly, the disparity between the needs of community members for services they consider fundamental for their future and the incentive of government to reach out to any population is not unique to the emerging Latino communities. Instead, it is a central theme in the study of politics. Frequently, community-based organization, mobilization and organized demand-making have resulted in government action to bridge this gap. More highly organized communities are more likely to receive the sorts of government services that the community demands.

We find, however, that the emerging Latino communities have not yet achieved at the mass level a high degree of community organization or the ability to convert this organization into political mobilization. Considering the high concentration of immigrants and the recent arrival of many Colombians, Dominicans, Guatemalans, and Salvadorans in the United States, these findings are not surprising. The challenges facing these largely-immigrant communities with respect to organization and mobilization are exacerbated by their demographic characteristics (particularly their high levels of labor force participation and low levels of formal education), as well as their satisfaction with the public services that they do use.

What are the foundations for community mobilization in these communities? The Emerging Latino Survey identified two — community-based organizations and non-electoral activities in politics (since so few are eligible to vote). Five types of organizations included a significant share of the

emerging Latino populations as members (see Table 3.1). One of these — churches — included a majority of Colombians and Dominicans and a large plurality of Salvadorans and Guatemalans as members. Church membership, however, is often passive and does not necessarily offer a foundation for community organization and demand-making.

Table 3.1 Organizational Membership, Ranked by Share of Respondents Reporting Membership in Each Organizational Type

	Colombian %	Dominican %	Guatemalan %	Salvadoran %
Membership in				
Church	63.8	64.6	47.9	44.0
PTA (among parents)	28.0	39.6	29.5	22.5
Sports club	24.1	18.1	19.7	18.4
Ethnic club	25.1	13.9	9.6	8.0
Social club	20.3	18.3	9.8	6.1
Labor union	9.7	14.8	5.6	7.7
Other club	6.9	3.2	2.7	2.7
Senior citizens club	5.1	4.6	2.1	2.7
Political club	3.2	4.9	2.1	2.4
Fraternal organization	4.5	3.2	1.1	0.5

Two possible avenues for community mobilization among emerging Latino populations are membership in community organizations and involvement in community politics. With respect to the first, we find that most frequently, respondents are members of churches, with PTA membership being the next most common.

The four other organizations to which sizable numbers of the respondents reported membership — PTAs (among parents), sports clubs, ethnic clubs, and social clubs — offer the potential for future community demand-making. The organizational inventory conducted during the second stage of the project demonstrated that this process is already occurring. As these data indicate, however, none of these organization types yet reaches a majority in the emerging Latino communities.

We found some differences in the levels of participation in community-based organizations related to gender and length of residence. Unfortunately for analytical purposes, these differences are not consistent across the emerging Latino populations. Dominican and Guatemalan women, for example, are more likely to be active in PTAs. This pattern does not appear, however, in the Colombian and Salvadoran populations. Dominican and Salvadoran men are considerably more likely to be members of labor unions then their female counterparts, though the overall rates of labor union membership are quite low in all four communities. The men

in all four communities are much more likely to be involved in sports clubs and the men in all of the communities except the Guatemalan community are more likely to be members of social clubs. Finally, Guatemalan men are more likely than Guatemalan women to be members of an ethnic club. These findings indicate that there are some organizational membership differences between the genders among the emerging Latino populations. They also show, however, that the differences are often unique to the individual national-origin group.

Longer-term immigrant residents were generally more likely to be members of community organizations than were more recent arrivals.

Longer-term immigrant residents were generally more likely to be members of community organizations than were more recent arrivals. As is the case with gender differences, these variations were not consistent across all organizations or for all national-origin groups. For three of the emerging Latino populations — Colombians, Dominicans, and Guatemalans, church membership was almost 50 percent higher among the immigrants with 15 or more years of residence than among those with five years or less residence. Among Salvadoran respondents, on the other hand, church membership remained constant at about 43 percent for all cohorts of immigrants, regardless of length of residence. Labor union memberships increased with time in the United States for Dominicans, Salvadorans, and Guatemalans, but declined for Colombians. As we have indicated elsewhere, PTA memberships dramatically increased over time for all groups but Salvadorans, for whom they increased, but only slightly. Colombians and Dominicans were much more likely to be in sports clubs after having been in the United States for 15 years, but membership rates were relatively constant for Salvadorans and Guatemalans. Although the impact varied on each national-origin group and for each type of community organizational activity, these results indicate that part of the process of incorporation for emerging Latino immigrants is an increasing rate of participation in community organizations. Although rates are low for these communities overall, the longer-term residents demonstrate that they were making the transition to more complete incorporation into U.S. society and using community organizations as a tool to achieve this goal.

When the somewhat low rates of organizational memberships among the emerging Latino communities are examined, it is important to recognize, that other populations in the United States also have relatively low rates of organizational membership. The emerging Latino communities are

more likely than non-Hispanic whites, for example, to be members of PTAs or churches and have comparable rates of union membership and sports club membership (Pachon 1997). Thus, at an organizational level, the emerging Latino populations demonstrate a civic engagement comparable to that of non-Hispanic whites. This civic engagement offers the potential to spur demand-making that can make public bureaucracies more responsive to the public policy needs of the emerging Latino populations. In the emerging Latino populations, these organizations have only sporadically been used as a foundation for political demand-making.

While the rates of emerging Latino population organizational memberships may appear low, membership rates in churches and PTAs are actually higher than those of non-Hispanic whites.

Another possible avenue for community political demand-making is involvement in community and electoral politics (see Table 3.2). According to the Emerging Latino Survey, survey respondents did not generally participate in a range of activities relating to these forms of politics. The only activity in which more than 10 percent of the respondents participated was "attending a public meeting." For the New York emerging Latino populations, signing a petition was also an activity undertaken by more than 10 percent of respondents, and Dominican men were almost twice as likely to have signed a petition as Dominican women.

The civic engagement of emerging Latino populations offers the potential to spur demand-making that can make public bureaucracies more responsive to their public policy needs.

Table 3.2 Involvement in Community Politics, Ranked by Frequency of Involvement in Each Political Activity

	Colombian	Dominican	Guatemalan	Salvadoran
	%	%	%	%
Political Activity				
Attended public meeting	14.3	16.8	11.5	13.4
Signed petition	14.1	14.3	5.6	7.0
Wore campaign button or posted campaign sign	5.6	9.6	8.0	6.7
Contacted media or public official	9.9	7.9	2.9	5.1
Attended political meeting	9.4	6.4	3.5	4.6
Contributed money to campaign	4.2	4.7	1.9	3.2
Worked for party or candidate	4.4	2.3	2.1	2.1

Low community political participation rates limit the effectiveness of community political activity as a short-term tool for political mobilization.

However, ultimately, the number of respondents involved in community politics is small. Community and electoral politics, then, are not a likely short-term tool to make demands for the delivery of more appropriate and more needed public services. These rates are considerably lower

than rates for similar activities among other U.S. populations, particularly non-Hispanic whites. Thus, in terms of non-electoral political activities, the emerging Latino populations are at a disadvantage in terms of demand-making to meet their public policy needs.

Although the numbers who reported that they had undertaken such activities remain small, the likelihood of participation increased for immigrants with fifteen years or more of residence. In almost all of the activities for each of the national origin groups reported on in Table 3.3, participation of longer term residents was higher than the average for all respondents (reported on in Table 3.2). Although we do not report the results in tabular form, participation in these community political activities for recent immigrants was low or non-existent.

Although the numbers who reported that they had undertaken community political activities remain small, the likelihood of participation increased for immigrants with fifteen years or more of residence.

Table 3.3 Involvement in Community Politics Among Immigrants with 15 Years of Residence or More

	Colombian %	Dominican %	Guatemalan %	Salvadoran %
Political Activity				
Attended public meeting	16.0	23.7	15.0	17.2
Signed petition	23.5	15.1	9.4	7.1
Wore campaign button or posted campaign sign	3.6	8.3	14.0	7.9
Contacted media or public official	7.1	11.9	5.6	7.8
Attended political meeting	12.8	9.4	5.7	8.6
Contributed money to campaign	7.0	7.1	2.8	6.3
Worked for party or candidate	7.9	3.6	4.7	2.4

In conclusion, the survey demonstrates that emerging Latino populations hold positive values toward the United States and toward the public services that they rely on. Yet, these positive attitudes could change. It is this potential for a change for the worse that creates an incentive for policy makers to reach out to these communities at a time when their community politics are more nascent. Interviews conducted with community organizational leaders indicated that connections between these communities and local government have begun to emerge in New York, but are less evident in Los Angeles. To the extent that governmental

authorities can focus on the issues that these communities identified as central to their policy needs — discrimination, language problems, immigration status — the positive attitudes evidenced here will continue to grow and these communities will continue to move toward full incorporation in the polity.

These communities, then, offer an opportunity for policy makers. Like many immigrant communities before them, they seek the opportunities of U.S. society and are willing to make the contributions that are expected of its members.

Endnotes

[1] We use these national-origin labels throughout this report to identify individuals in the United States who trace their origin or ancestry to Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, or El Salvador. We identify people of common ancestry or origin as co-ethnics and co-nationals. Thus, the co-ethnics or co-nationals of a Colombian respondent are all U.S. citizens or residents who trace their ancestry or origin to Colombia. Finally, we use the terms Hispanic and Latino interchangeably to refer to people who trace their ancestry or origin to the Spanish-speaking countries of Latin America and the Caribbean.

[2] By conducting a random telephone survey, we faced some overall challenges which make it difficult for our survey sample to be perfectly representative of the demographic composition of the population under study. Some households, for example, do not have telephones. Our survey design precludes speaking to people in these households. Equally problematic, some people will not want to participate in telephone surveys. With respect to this challenge, the organizer of the survey has more control. Individuals who do not initially express an interest in participating in the survey can be contacted again and urged to participate — a strategy that we pursued, often successfully. Even with these added efforts, however, some people will not participate. Previous research has shown that these non-respondents are not equally distributed across all segments of the population. In the emerging Latino populations, for example, individuals who are concerned about their status in the United States — for example undocumented immigrants — are less likely to respond. As we will show, we did interview people whose immigration status we could not determine. We suspect, however, that in general we under-sampled the undocumented and recent immigrants.

[3] Under the provisions of the Immigration Act of 1990, the Immigration and Naturalization Service granted Temporary Protected Status (TPS) to certain immigrants (including Salvadorans) from countries subject to armed conflict, natural disaster or other extraordinary conditions. Recipients of TPS are permitted to stay and work in the United States temporarily. TPS recipients also have the opportunity to seek permanent residency if they otherwise qualify for it, but TPS status does not guarantee they will be successful. In 1992, TPS was discontinued, and the protections offered to TPS recipients were provided under the Deferred Enforced Departure program.

[4] In a follow-up study of approximately 80 respondents who initially reported that they were permanent residents, approximately 20 percent subsequently reported that they were not permanent residents. We cannot evaluate how representative these 80 re-surveyed permanent residents are or whether other resurveyed respondents misreported their immigration status.

[5] AFDC has subsequently been renamed Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF).

[6] As we were conducting the survey, the eligibility of many of the respondents for federally mandated social welfare programs was in flux. While many more were eligible at the time of the survey than were six months later, many might have been confused about their eligibility. During the survey, long-term permanent resident aliens were eligible for such programs as AFDC, Medicaid, and Supplemental Security Income (SSI). Recently arrived permanent residents (those with fewer than three to five years of residence) and the undocumented were not eligible for these programs at the time of the survey. All respondents were (and are) eligible for emergency medical services as are their children for public education. Subsequently, most legal permanent residents lost eligibility for these programs, including SSI and Food Stamps. However, at this writing legislation restoring SSI benefits to some of those legal permanent residents had been enacted, although they are still ineligible for Food Stamps.

[7] Slightly more than one-third of immigrant respondents reported having lived in the United States for 15 years or more.

[8] Among immigrant respondents, approximately 12 percent reported five or fewer years of residence and 52 percent reported between 6 and 14 years of residence.

Sources Cited

de la Garza, Rodolfo O.; Louis DeSipio; F. Chris García; John A. García; and Angelo Falcón. 1992. *Latino Voices: Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban Perspectives on American Politics*. Boulder CO: Westview Press.

Grebler, Leo; Joan Moore; and Ralph Guzman. 1970. *The Mexican American People: The Nation's Second Largest Minority*. New York: The Free Press.

NALEO Educational Fund and Tomás Rivera Policy Institute. 1997*a*. *Constructing the New York Area Hispanic Mosaic: A Demographic Portrait of Colombians and Dominicans in New York*. Los Angeles and Claremont, CA: NALEO Educational Fund and Tomás Rivera Policy Institute.

NALEO Educational Fund and Tomás Rivera Policy Institute. 1997*b*. *Diversifying the New York Area Hispanic Mosaic: Colombian and Dominican Leaders' Assessments of Community Public Policy Needs*. Los Angeles and Claremont, CA: NALEO Educational Fund and Tomás Rivera Policy Institute.

Pachon, Harry. 1997. "Presentation Notes Before the National Commission on Civic Renewal, January 25, 1997." Claremont, CA: Tomás Rivera Policy Institute.

Pachon, Harry, and Louis DeSipio. 1994. *New Americans By Choice: Political Perspectives of Latino Immigrants*. Boulder CO: Westview Press.

Tomás Rivera Policy Institute and NALEO Educational Fund. 1997*a*. *Constructing the Los Angeles Area Latino Mosaic: A Demographic Portrait of Guatemalans and Salvadorans in Los Angeles*. Claremont, CA and Los Angeles: Tomás Rivera Policy Institute and NALEO Educational Fund.

Tomás Rivera Policy Institute and NALEO Educational Fund. 1997*b*. *Diversifying the Los Angeles Area Latino Mosaic: Salvadoran and Guatemalan Leaders' Assessments of Community Public Needs*. Claremont, CA and Los Angeles: Tomás Rivera Policy Institute and NALEO Educational Fund.

Appendix
Sampling Methodology

Data for the study of Emerging Latino Populations were collected in two concurrent telephone surveys, one in Los Angeles County for persons of Guatemalan and Salvadoran ancestry or origin, and the other in the New York City metropolitan area for persons of Colombian and Dominican ancestry or origin. The sampling employed single-stage random-digit-dialing (RDD) with quotas for the four groups of interest, resulting in a probabilistic combined sample of 1503 households, divided almost equally: 376, 375, 375, and 377, respectively. In both surveys, budget considerations dictated that sampling be confined to areas where, at the time of the 1990 census, population densities of either target population equaled or exceeded ten percent.

Los Angeles County: Guatemalans and Salvadorans

Population densities for both Guatemalans and Salvadorans was 10 percent or more in 32 of the Los Angeles County census tracts. The density of Guatemalans was 10 percent or more in an additional 5 tracts, and the density of Salvadorans was 10 percent or more in an additional 74 tracts. Population densities in the combined 152 tracts averaged 6.6 percent and 14.6 percent, respectively. Furthermore, these 111 tracts accounted for 30 percent of total Guatemalans in the county, and 34 percent of Salvadorans at the time of the 1990 Census.

With help from Genesys Sampling Systems, the field subcontractor Elrick & Lavidge (E&L) identified the telephone exchanges that serve the 111 tracts. From these exchanges, E&L employed random digit dialing (RDD), to generate a random sample of 26,233 telephone numbers. Of these, 9,336 were non-residential or non-working numbers and 5,900 were not successfully contacted after seven attempts. Of the 10,997 identified residences, 2,523 refused the screening, and 7,467 had no Guatemalans or Salvadorans in the household. Of the remaining, 18 refused to interview, 751 were interviewed, and 238 were Salvadoran households not interviewed because the target sample size for that group had already been met.

Non-response rates can be calculated in various ways. About 22.5 percent of sampled telephone numbers were not successfully contacted, 22.9 percent of identified households refused screening, and 2.3 percent of households identified as qualified refused to interview.

New York Metropolitan Area (New York City and Northern New Jersey): Colombians and Dominicans

All census tracts in New York and New Jersey were screened for population density, but the preponderance of tracts that met our density requirement are in New York City, and the few outlying tracts are all within three miles of Manhattan Island. Residential patterns for Colombians and Dominicans in the New York area overlap much less than for Guatemalans and Salvadorans in Los Angeles County. According to the 1990 Census, population densities for both Colombians and Dominicans was 10 percent or more in only 22 tracts. The density of Colombians was 10 percent or more in an additional 69 tracts, and the density of Dominicans was 10 percent or more in an additional 195 tracts. Population densities in the combined 286 tracts averaged 6.6 percent and 14.6 percent, respectively. These 286 tracts accounted for 30 percent of total Colombians and 67 percent of Dominicans in New York State and northern New Jersey.

As in Los Angeles, E&L identified the telephone exchanges that serve the 286 tracts. From these exchanges, E&L employed RDD to generate two samples: a sample of 10,881 telephone numbers from all 286 tracts (252 exchanges), plus an additional sample of 15,182 telephone

numbers from the subset of 91 tracts (25 exchanges) that are high-density Colombian. Of the total 25,063 telephone numbers from the combined samples, 5,701 were non-residential or non-working and 5,099 were not successfully contacted after seven attempts. Of the 14,263 identified residences, 4,007 refused the screening, and 9,265 had no Colombians or Dominicans in the household. Of the remaining, 21 refused to interview, 752 were interviewed, and 218 were Dominican households not interviewed because the target sample size for that group had already been met.

Summarizing non-response, 20.3 percent of sampled telephone numbers were not successfully contacted, 28.1 percent of identified households refused screening, and 2.7 percent of households identified as qualified refused to interview.

Weighting

Relative sampling weights for households are computed as the reciprocal of selection probabilities, multiplied by a convenient constant for scaling purposes:

	n	Probability	Relative Weight
Los Angeles			
Guatemalans	376	.0178	3.71
Salvadorans	375	.0108	6.07
New York, high-Colombian exchanges only			
Colombians	338	.0660	1.00
Dominicans	162	.0429	1.54
New York, low-Colombian exchanges only			
Colombians	37	.0041	16.00
Dominicans	215	.0026	25.70

Differences in weight values result from different sampling rates in the two regions, from different sampling rates in high-Colombian and low-Colombian exchanges, and from screening out Salvadorans and Dominicans once their intended sample sizes had been met. These weights are relative values, and can be used in various ways, depending on how the data are pooled for particular analyses.

For Los Angeles, analyses that compare Guatemalans with Salvadorans would require no weighting; but if the two groups are pooled, then the sampling weights should be used. Since the New York respondents are in effect from two samples, the weights should be used regardless of whether Colombians and Dominicans are compared as separate groups or pooled. If it is required that analysis weights sum to sample size, then the sampling weights should be multiplied by a constant appropriate to how the data are pooled. Again, if Guatemalans and Salvadorans are to be compared as separate groups, no weighting is required, but if they are to be pooled, the analysis weights would be:

$$Wi = RWi[(376+375)/(376(3.71)+375(6.07))] = .205RWi$$

= .76 for Guatemalans

= 1.24 for Salvadorans

where sample sizes and relative sampling weights (RWi) are from the table above.

For Colombians and Dominicans not pooled, the analysis weights for Colombians would be, respectively

Wi = RWi[375/(338+37(16))]
= .403 if from high-Colombian exchanges
= 6.452 if from low-Colombian exchanges

And for Dominicans,

Wi = RWi[377/(162(1.54)+215(25.7))]
= .100 if from high-Colombian exchanges
= 1.678 if from low-Colombian exchanges

For pooled Colombians and Dominicans,

Wi =RWi[(375+377)/(338+37(16)+162(1.54)+215(25.7))]
= .112 for Colombians from high-Colombian exchanges
= 1.794 for Colombians from low-Colombian exchanges
= .173 for Dominicans from high-Colombian exchanges
= 2.882 for Dominicans from low-Colombian exchanges

Since budget considerations dictated that sampling frames be limited to areas where the four target populations concentrate (rather than including all of Los Angeles and all of the New York area), analysts may want to build weights that project each case to its full proportion equivalent of households in the two regions. This type of "projection" weight can be obtained by expanding the analysis weights calculated above (that weight to sample size). Projection weights for Los Angeles data (pooled or unpooled) would be the ratio of population size to sample size times average household size:

159000/376H = 422.9/H for Guatemalans
301000/375H = 802.7/H for Salvadorans

where the average household size, H, is estimated separately for each target group from sample data. For New York data, the projection weights would be

132000Wi/375H for Colombians = 141.9/H if from high-Colombian exchanges
= 2271.1/H if from low-Colombian exchanges
373000Wi/377H for Dominicans = 98.9/H if from high-Colombian exchanges
= 1660.2/H if from low-Colombian exchanges

where the Wi are those calculated above for unpooled data (population sizes are from 1990 census data). These weights compensate for differential non-response between regions and among target respondent groups; the weights do not compensate, of course, for systematic differences between responders and non-responders.

Confidence Intervals

As a general benchmark for sampling accuracy, it is useful to create a table of confidence intervals keyed to simple sample estimates. The formula for weighted estimates of proportions (ignoring finite population correction) is p = Sumi[WiXi/n] where n = sample size, i=1,...,n, Xi = 1 or 0, and Sumi[Wi] = n.

The standard error can be estimated as the square root of: var[p] = P(1-P)Sumi[Wi2]/n2 where P is the assumed underlying population value for the estimated proportion. The +/- bounds for estimation intervals at .95 confidence are estimated as 1.96 times the standard error. Values for the +/- bounds are presented below for various subsets of the data base, and for various values of P (all values are in percentage format): 10, 20, 30, 40, and 50.

Population Proportions:	90	80	70	60	50	
Guatemalans (n=376)	3	4	4.6	5	5.1	
Salvadorans (n=375)	3	4	4.6	5	5.1	
Colombians (n=375)	6.3	8.3	9.6	10.2	10.4	
Dominicans (n=377)	3.8	5.1	5.9	6.3	6.4	
Guatemalans + Salvadorans	2.2	2.9	3.4	3.6	3.7	(n=751)
Colombians + Dominicans	3.7	4.9	5.6	6	6.1	(n=752)
Total Sample	2.1	2.9	3.3	3.5	3.6	(n=1503)

Differences in the values from group to group reflect sample size and the rather high variation in weights for the New York sample.